

REMARKS:Status

Claims 1 to 41 are pending. Claims 1, 4, 11, 16, 21, 27, 30, and 37 have been amended. Claims 1, 16, and 27 are the independent claims. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Drawing Objection

The Office Action objected to Figure 2 as failing to include reference signs mentioned in the description, namely elements 212(a-c), 213(a-d), 219(a), and 221(a). Applicant has amended Figure 2 to include these elements. Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections

Claims 1 to 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,275,939 (Garrison) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,604,862 (Midgely).

Telephonic Interview and Discussion

Applicant's representative Dane C. Butzer conducted a telephonic interview with the Examiner on November 1, 2005, at approximately 2:00 p.m. EDT. Mr. Butzer made a follow-up telephone call to the Examiner shortly thereafter.

Agreement was reached that Applicant's amendment of claim 1 to read as follows distinguishes that claim from the teachings of Garrison:

1. A method including
receiving a user request for an object at a server;
performing an operation on data associated with said object at a cluster device, said operation including accessing said object at said server and determining a result of scanning said object at said cluster device; and
conditionally allowing access to said object in response to said user request and said a result.

In particular, it was agreed that Garrison did not teach that the operation at the cluster device included "determining a result of scanning said object at said cluster device."

Applicant has reviewed the other applied reference, namely Midgely, and sees nothing therein that remedies the foregoing deficiency of Garrison. Accordingly, claim 1 and its dependent claims are believed to be allowable over the applied art. Such action is respectfully requested.

The form of claim 16 differs from the form of claim 1. As amended, claim 16 recites in part "a second message from said cluster device to said server, said second message indicating a result of a scanning operation performed at said cluster device on said requested one object." This feature is believed to embody substantially the same characteristics as those discussed above. Accordingly, claim 16 and its dependent claims also are believed to be allowable over the applied art. Such action is respectfully requested.

Amended claim 27 recites a memory or mass storage including instructions interpretable by a computing device, with the instruction directing the computing device to perform

the same steps as amended claim 1. Allowance of claim 27 and its dependent claims therefore also is respectfully requested.

No Admission


Applicant's decision not to argue each of the dependent claims separately is not an admission that the subject matter of those claims is taught by the applied art.

Closing

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicant's undersigned attorney can be reached at (614) 205-3241. All correspondence should continue to be directed to the address indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,



Dane C. Butzer
Reg. No. 43,521

Dated: November 1, 2005

Swernofsky Law Group PC
P.O. Box 390013
Mountain View, CA 94039-0013
(650) 947-0700

IN THE DRAWINGS:

A replacement sheet for Figure 2 accompanies this response. The changes made in this replacement sheet are as follows: Elements 212(a-c), 213(a-d), 219a and 221a have been added as required by the Office Action.